

DAVID MCKEAN,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL  
HEALTH,  
  
Defendant.

This matter is before the Court upon the motion of plaintiff for leave to commence this action without prepayment of the filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Upon consideration of the financial information provided with the motion, the Court finds that plaintiff is financially unable to pay any portion of the filing fee. As a result, plaintiff will be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Additionally, the Court has reviewed the complaint and will dismiss it pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from

such relief. An action is frivolous if it “lacks an arguable basis in either law or fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action is malicious if it is undertaken for the purpose of harassing the named defendants and not for the purpose of vindicating a cognizable right. *Spencer v. Rhodes*, 656 F. Supp. 458, 461-63 (E.D.N.C. 1987), *aff’d* 826 F.2d 1059 (4th Cir. 1987).

To determine whether an action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, the Court must engage in a two-step inquiry. First, the Court must identify the allegations in the complaint that are not entitled to the assumption of truth. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1950-51 (2009). These include “legal conclusions” and “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action [that are] supported by mere conclusory statements.” *Id.* at 1949. Second, the Court must determine whether the complaint states a plausible claim for relief. *Id.* at 1950-51. This is a “context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.” *Id.* at 1950. The plaintiff is required to plead facts that show more than the “mere possibility of misconduct.” *Id.* The Court must review the factual allegations in the complaint “to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief.” *Id.* at 1951. When faced with alternative explanations for the alleged misconduct, the Court may exercise its judgment in determining whether plaintiff’s conclusion is the

most plausible or whether it is more likely that no misconduct occurred. *Id.* at 1950, 51-52.

### **The Complaint**

Plaintiff, a patient at St. Louis Psychiatric Rehabilitation Center, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging violations of his civil rights. Named as the defendant is the Missouri Department of Mental Health. Plaintiff asserts that he has been subjected to unlawful imprisonment under the 8th and 14th Amendments to the United States Constitution. Specifically, plaintiff states that after being arrested for possession of a controlled substance, “the department of mental health accepted the plaintiff in the Department of Mental Health against his will as Not guilty by reason of insanity, the plaintiff lost...job and freedom without any evaluation by the department of mental health to determine if the plaintiff was insane for possessing an uncontrolled [sic] substance.” Plaintiff seeks both monetary and injunctive relief.

### **Discussion**

The complaint fails to state a claim against the Missouri Department of Mental Health. *See, e.g., Barket, Levy & Fine, Inc. v. St. Louis Thermal Energy Corp.*, 948 F.2d 1084, 1086 (8th Cir. 1991) (agency exercising state power is not “person” subject to § 1983 suit); *Van Orden v. Blake*, 2008 WL 4921796, No. 4:07CV940 ERW (E.D. Mo. November 13, 2008). As a result, the complaint is subject to dismissal.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis [Doc. #2] is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint because the complaint is legally frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or both.

An appropriate Order of Dismissal shall accompany this Memorandum and Order.

Dated this 10th day of November, 2009.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Henry Edward Autrey", is written above a horizontal line.

HENRY EDWARD AUTREY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE